



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,067	12/21/2001	Tong Shi	S01.12-0860/STL 10458	2905

27365 7590 08/09/2006

SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC C/O WESTMAN
CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, GLENDA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,067

Applicant(s)

SHI, TONG

Examiner

Glenda P. Rodriguez

Art Unit

2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-22, 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 7-12, 15-18, 20-22 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6, 385, 239).

Regarding Claim 1, Okamoto et al. teach a method of identifying an equalization target for a channel, the method comprising:

Measuring a goodness metric for a first candidate target by reading data through the channel (Col. 7, L. 34-54, wherein it teaches receiving the output target value metric from the equalization circuit.);

Measuring the goodness metric for a second candidate target by reading data through the channel (Col. 7, L. 39-Col. 8, L. 8, wherein it estimates between the received value and estimated signal);

Comparing the measure of the goodness metric of the first candidate target to the measure of the goodness metric of the second candidate target and selecting the target with the better measure of the goodness metric (Col. 7, L. 34-61, wherein a error detection value is taken from the comparison. See also Col. 8, L. 8-34 and L. 48-67); and

Modifying the selected equalization target to improve the measure of the goodness metric (Col.8, L. 8-33 and Col. 48-67).

Regarding Claim 2, Okamoto et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. Okamoto et al. further teaches wherein setting the first candidate target in the channel (Col. 7, L. 34-44); placing an equalizer in the channel into adaptation mode until the equalizer adapts itself to produce equalized data that approaches the first candidate target; taking the equalizer out of adaptation mode (Col. 8, L. 8-33 and 48-67); using the equalizer to form equalized data; and measuring the goodness metric based on the equalized metric (Col. 8, L. 8-33 and 48-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. in view of McEwen et al. (US Patent No. 6, 732, 328).

Regarding Claim 3, Okamoto et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 1. However, Okamoto et al. does not explicitly teach wherein performing post-processing on the equalized data to form post-processing data; and measuring the number of parity errors in the post processing data. McEwen et al. teaches this limitation on Fig. 2 along with its Description. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Okamoto et al.'s invention with the teaching of McEwen et al. in order to control the errors in the processed data.

5. Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. in view of Sawaguchi et al. (US Patent No. 5, 539, 588).

Regarding Claim 5, Okamoto et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. However, Okamoto et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the first candidate target and the second candidate target are constrained to have a spectral null. Sawaguchi et al. teaches wherein the first candidate target and the second candidate target are constrained to have a spectral null (Col. 3, L. 34-52. Sawaguchi et al. teach a magnetic recording/reproducing apparatus in which it selects the next to the lowest spectral null constraint.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Okamoto et al.'s invention with the teaching of Sawaguchi et al. in order to improve the frequency characteristic degradation in the medium (Pat. No. 5, 539, 588; Col. 2, L. 12-19).

Regarding Claim 7, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Sawaguchi et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 5. The combination further teach wherein modifying the selected equalization target for the channel comprises changing the equalization target to form a new target that does not have the spectral null (Col. 3, L. 34-52 of Sawaguchi et al. Sawaguchi et al. teach a magnetic recording/reproducing apparatus in which it selects the next to the lowest spectral null constraint.).

6. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. in view of Sridharan et al. ("A 110 MHz 350mW 0.6 μ CMOS 16-State Generalized-Target Viterbi Detector for Disk Drive Read Channels").

Regarding Claim 11, Okamoto et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 1. However, Okamoto et al. does not explicitly teach wherein "separately identifying an equalization target

Art Unit: 2627

for each of a set of heads; counting the number of times each equalization target was identified; and selecting the equalization target that was identified for the most heads as the equalization target for the channel". Sridharan et al. does teach that an adaptive equalization technique as claimed in which it can be further be employed in a plurality of heads (Page, 367, 1st Column, Second Paragraph). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Okamoto et al.'s invention with the teaching of Sridharan et al. in order to be able to extract the error signal for LMS adaptation.

Regarding Claim 12, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Sridharan et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 11. The combination further teaches separately identifying an equalization target for each of a set of head/zone pairs and selecting the equalization target that was identified for the most head/zone pairs as the equalization target for the channel (Page, 367, 1st Column, Second Paragraph of Sridharan et al.).

7. Claims 15, 16, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. in view of Cideciyan et al. (US Patent No. 6, 377, 635).

Regarding Claims 15 and 22, Okamoto et al. teach a method to select out of a plurality of targets for the best metric for equalization as claimed (See Col. 7, L. 34-61 and explanation in Claim 1). However, Okamoto et al. does not explicitly teach wherein the targets have to satisfy a spectral null. Cideciyan et al. does teach targets chosen by a ACS circuit in a Viterbi detector being modified in a channel in order to minimize or no longer satisfy a spectral null (See Col. 3, L. 23-43 of Cideciyan et al.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify Okamoto et al.'s invention with the teaching of

Cideciyan et al. in order to provide a method for implementing high-speed and area efficient architectures for Viterbi detection of generalized partial-response signals.

Method claim (22) is drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claim (15). Therefore method claim (22) corresponds to apparatus claim (15) and is rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Regarding Claim 16, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. teaches all the limitations of Claims 15, respectively. The combination further teach wherein the modifying the equalization target for the channel to improve the measure of the goodness metric (See Summary of Okamoto et al., wherein it teaches choosing the path that improves the target metric and reduces error.).

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 15. The combination further teach wherein locating an initial equalization target that provides a best goodness measure comprises locating an equalization target that generates the fewest parity errors in the data produced by the channel (See Summary of Okamoto et al., wherein it teaches updating and changing the equalizing values (or metrics) in order to improve the performance and reduce the error.).

8. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Sridharan et al. (*IEEE Transactions on Solid-State Circuits*, Vol. 35, No. 3, March 2000).

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 15. However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein “separately identifying an equalization target for each of a set of heads; counting the number of times each

Art Unit: 2627

equalization target was identified; and selecting the equalization target that was identified for the most heads as the equalization target for the channel. However, Sridharan et al. does teach that an adaptive equalization technique as claimed in which it can be further be employed in a plurality of heads (Page, 367, 1st Column, Second Paragraph). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination's invention with the teaching of Sridharan et al. in order to be able to extract the error signal for LMS adaptation.

Regarding Claim 21, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. teach all the limitations of Claim 15. However, the combination does not explicitly teach separately identifying an equalization target for each of a set of head/zone pairs and selecting the equalization target that was identified for the most head/zone pairs as the equalization target for the channel. Sridharan et al. teaches this limitation in Page, 367, 1st Column, Second Paragraph.

9. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. and Sawaguchi et al. as applied to claims 7 above, and further in view of Sugawara et al. (US Patent No. 6, 501, 610). Regarding Claims 8, 9 and 10, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Sawaguchi et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 7, respectively. The combination does not explicitly teach wherein modifying the equalization target for the channel comprises sequentially adjusting single terms, increasing terms and exchanging pairs of terms in the equalization target for the channel. This limitation is taught by Sugawara et al. in Col. 9, L. 10-25, wherein it teaches the modification of the tap coefficients in the medium in order to adapt to the chosen target (It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to know that when modifications of the tap coefficients are being employed, all these different cases could arise and

can be employed if by doing so it guarantees a reduction of error in the equalized signal being processed by the read back channel.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination's invention with the teaching of Sugawara et al. in order to read the data more efficiently and with less errors.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Sugawara et al. (US Patent No. 6, 501, 610). Regarding Claim 17, the combination of Okamoto et al. and Cideciyan et al. teaches all the limitations of Claim 16. However, the combination does not explicitly teach wherein modifying the equalization target for the channel comprises sequentially adjusting single terms, increasing terms and exchanging pairs of terms in the equalization target for the channel. This limitation is taught by Okamoto et al. in Col. 10, L. 51-67 – Col. 11, 1-10, wherein it teaches the modification of the tap coefficients in the medium in order to adapt to the chosen target (It is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to know that when modifications of the tap coefficients are being employed, all these different cases could arise and can be employed if by doing so it guarantees a reduction of error in the equalized signal being processed by the read back channel.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the combination's invention with the teaching of Sugawara et al. in order to read the data more efficiently and with less errors.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 14 is allowed.

11. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding Claim 14, the reasons for allowance are cited in the Office Action dated 3/31/05.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

12. Claims 13 and 19 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims, 1-3, 7-22 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion



14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US Patent No. 6, 477, 125 to Hayami, Japanese Patent 08212716 A to Sugawara et al. and European Patent Application 0622798 A2.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenda P. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7561. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday: 7:00-5:00; alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on (571) 272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


gpi
07/24/06.
WAYNE YOUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER